



---

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013**  
**ENHANCE IRWM OBJECTIVE**  
**9:00 – 10:00 A.M.**  
**815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA**

**Meeting Objectives**

Discuss and suggest revisions for the Related Actions associated with the Update 2013 Objective relating to IRWM:

“Strengthen Integrated Regional Water Management planning to improve regional self-sufficiency, and maintain and enhance regional water management partnerships.”

**Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review**

The Update 2013 Objectives Web-a-thon was held on June 13-14, 2013 to discuss the draft 17 Objectives and the associated Related Action for the Water Plan. Introductions were made around the room and online. Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management Branch, welcomed everyone and noted that an online wrap up session will be conducted on July 9<sup>th</sup>, to conclude any items needing additional discussion. He explained that the workbook was prepared by DWR staff and subject matter experts, and is for discussion purposes only. The first few pages of this draft document provide definitions of terms and the Water Plan mission, vision and goals – which sets the context for the objectives and related actions. A brief review of the IRWM objective and related actions would be followed by discussion on the text.

**Overview**

Jose Alarcon, DWR Project Team, provided brief background on how the objectives and related actions were developed. He and Francisco Guzman have reviewed the 37 Featured State Plans, related state agency plans with bearing on the Water Plan, and correlated the respective recommendations with the Water Plan objectives. These were forwarded to the subject matter experts for consideration in updating the related actions for each objective. Collectively, the objectives identify what is needed to accomplish the goals of the Water Plan. The related actions represent what is needed to accomplish each particular objective.

The workbook contains a column for performance measures, which will help track each action and inform the next Water Plan Progress Report. Draft measures have been proposed for some of the objectives, and feedback is welcomed on potential performance measures – as well as the objectives and related actions.

.



---

## Document Walk Through

Tracie Billington, DWR, Chief, IRWM Financial Assistance Branch, reviewed the IRWM Objective. She observed that IRWM groups now cover 99% of the State's population. She referred to the Related Actions, found on page 3 of the workbook. Many of the 2009 related action have been accomplished and were deleted from the 2013 text.

Mike Floyd, DWR, IRWM Regional Planning Branch and Project Manager for the Strategic Plan for the Future of IRWM in California, described the strategic planning efforts as informing the practice of IRWM and supporting future IRWM activities throughout the state. This effort is underway and will serve as a Companion Plan to Update 2013, and the content of the IRWM Strategic Plan will be incorporated into the Water Plan. Mr. Floyd reported that 5 vision and goals workshops had been conducted in April and May, with 5 objectives workshops scheduled for August and September. Additional workshops are planned to focus on specific actions.

As a result, the related actions previewed during this objective session may be modified as the IRWM Strategic Plan progresses. Participants were encouraged to attend future workshops. Anyone interested in receiving information on future IRWM Strategic Plan meetings should sign up to join the email list at: [www.water.ca.gov/irwm/stratplan/subscribe.cfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/stratplan/subscribe.cfm).

## Related Actions

The proposed Related Actions, and the ensuing discussion, are presented below:

1. As State-supported IRWM planning enters its second decade, State government should continue that support well into the future to help ensure continued IRWM planning and implementation throughout California.

### Discussion:

- One comment was that this action seems hazy. It was proposed to drop the word "help." And rather than "support," say "provide direction," which could consist of specific actions. It was suggested that existing IRWM plans be reviewed to see how well they correspond to the objectives.
- Another comment was that Objective #1 seemed repetitive. It seems as though actions #1 and #2 could easily be combined.
- There was agreement that this action seems like an umbrella statement and is somewhat vague, it could be deleted. Or perhaps it represents a commitment, with the other items representing sub-actions.



2. State government should support on-going IRWM planning and implementation efforts through the timely delivery of financial support.

Discussion:

There was a question as to whether there would be another column for funding possibilities. There is a desire to know the status of what's out there. It was suggested to keep a summary online and updated, clarifying what is being funded.

3. State government should establish a clear vision for the future of IRWM in California.

Discussion:

#3 is helpful.

4. State government should implement the recommendations from the Strategic Plan for the Future of IRWM in California (IRWM Strategic Plan).

Discussion:

No comments.

5. State government should acknowledge that additional assistance is needed IRWM regions with significant critical water management needs, in particular, where communities lack safe drinking water or sanitation.

Discussion:

There was a comment this this action is a carryover from Update 2009. There was an inquiry as to whether this is an aggressive enough "ask" for what is wanted. Who needs to acknowledge the need for assistance? It was noted that the Water Plan and legislature are somewhat iterative processes. This represents a chance to ask the legislature for something that we want for IRWM.

A follow-up comment observed that the legislature is attentive to water needs. If these actions are going to be directed towards legislators, they need to be oriented away from plans and towards people. The language needs to be directed towards providing a roadmap for ensuring that all Californians have safe drinking water.

There was general agreement that the State should help identify the extent and scale of this issue, along with the potential resources. Specifically, there should be an attempt to quantify the amount of assistance needed and putting a number out there. This action should be more about prioritizing and identifying the importance of this issue.



6. State government should help coalesce and consolidate various local and regional water management planning efforts – such as groundwater management plans, urban and agricultural water management plans, alluvial fan water resource management efforts, salt and nutrient management plans, storm water resource management plans – into IRWM plans with the goal of reducing the requirement/need for separate, single-purpose plans, and to improve efficiency and coordination.

Discussion:

There was general discussion that the words “coalesce and consolidate” are not the right words for this action. A primary consideration is practicality. For example, a water district’s service area may encompass 8 different IRWMs. Each agency does their own Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). It would be difficult to break the UWMP into 8 pieces. “Consolidation” is likely not practical or desirable. Also, each plan has their own constituencies, areas of focus, geographic scale and stakeholder processes.

It was noted that an IRWM coalition is partly a geographic issue. There are some concerns within the flood caucus, and among others, that IRWMs seem to have very little that addresses flood problems. This comes up against the boundary issue – flood issues should be addressed within a river system or on a watershed basis, which may not align with an IRWM boundary. There are broader issues that relate to IRWMs, such as riparian issues, habitat conservation plans and flood plans. It would be helpful to point to (and encourage) those linkages between different types of plans.

There was general support for this action describing an approach for “integrating” the different types of plans, or encouraging linkages between them. If the IRWM Plans provide linkages to other plans, it will increase the access to information by users of the Water Plan. It was suggested that plans should be consistent with one another.

The underlying goal of encouraging consistencies and trying to simplify planning requirements was appreciated. The concerns were that: the State may not have the authority to coalesce and consolidate planning requirements; it is impractical due to boundary issues; and that required plans should not be lumped into a voluntary plan.

It was also noted that some of these plans are implemented in various permits with various responsible parties. These linkages could be specified in the permits, with the possibility of making the plan linkage specific and enforceable.

There was a suggestion that action items from various plans should be implemented regionally, and that the State should help remove obstacles to integration.

Another suggestion was to provide the flexibility that a comprehensive IRWM plan could address separate plan requirements. This would involve establishing an equivalency option where one equivalent document could satisfy other planning requirements, rather than generating a separate document. It was noted that some independent entities will not want to subordinate their propriety interests in deference to other interests. Conversely,



some entities are interested in being part of the IRWM planning processes for integration and funding purposes.

It was suggested that land use planning, flood, floodplains, and energy be added to the list of planning requirements.

## **Metrics**

Suggestions and comments on metrics included the following:

Action #1: It would be difficult to develop a metric for this item.

Action #2: What does “timely” mean? There was a suggestion to change the word “timely” to “annual.”

Action #3: Put a date this with a timeline for update.

Action #4: Will there be metrics for implementing the IWRM Strategic Plan? These should be included in this action.

Action #5: A metric would include a webpage, updated annually, that describes critical water management needs, level of assistance needed and level of funding currently committed (to identify what is being funded and what still needs funding).

Action #6 is complex, and land use should be added to the list. A suggestion was that perhaps the IRWMs could report annually on integrating with other plans – although this was discouraged by another participant. The goal should be to save resources, reduce duplication and encourage the sharing of information.

Ask IRWM regional groups to have their plans include a description of linkages to other component plans. Consistency reports are one approach for addressing this – it is informative and don’t involve enforcement capability. This action also touches on agency alignment issues.

Note: For actions #2 and #5, where funding would be part of the metric, the question was asked whether the metric would track funding appropriations or funding distributions.

It was strongly suggested that the actions not be developed as “thou shalt” directives to IRWMs.



## **Attendance**

### *In-Room*

Rebecca Crebbin-Coates, Planning and Conservation League  
John Hopkins, Institute for Ecological Health  
Karl Longley, California Water Institute, CSU Fresno  
Bob Siegfried, Carmel Area Wastewater District

Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Lead  
Tracie Billington, DWR, Integrated Regional Water Management, Financial Assistance Chief  
Megan Fidell, DWR, RMS Coordinator, Progress Report Lead  
Mike Floyd, DWR, Integrated Regional Water Management, Regional Planning  
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management  
Francisco Guzman, DWR, Companion Plans and Objectives Lead  
Paul Massera, DWR, Water Plan Program Manager  
Lewis Moeller, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager  
Maury Roos, DWR, Chief Hydrologist  
  
Lisa Beutler, MWH, Water Plan Executive Facilitator  
Judie Talbot, CCP, Facilitator

### *Webinar*

Angela Anderson, Bureau of Reclamation  
Erika Barraza, Carollo Engineers  
Dave Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies  
Troy Boone, County of Santa Cruz  
Kurt Broz, Pala Tribe  
Karen Buhr, California Association of Resource Conservation Districts  
Celeste Cantu, Santa Ana Watershed Protection Agency  
Ronnie Cohen, journalist  
Jerry De La Piedra, Santa Clara Valley Water District  
Debbie Espe, San Diego County Water Agency  
Gina Ford, California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Aaron Fukuda, Tulare Irrigation District  
Milasol Gaslan, Santa Ana Regional Water Board  
Carol Hall, Kleinfelder  
Earle Hartling, Los Angeles County Sanitation District  
Jack Hawks, California Water Association  
Alex Kim, UC Irvine  
Kathy Mannion, Regional Council of Rural Counties  
Margie Namba, Granite Construction  
Mark Norton, Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority

## Objectives Web-a-thon

### Enhance Integrated Regional Water Management

June 13, 2013

---



Eric Osterling, Kings River Conservation District  
Tracy Slavin, Bureau of Reclamation  
Tony St. Amant, Water Policy Advocate  
Sergio Vargas, Ventura County Watershed Protection District  
Mike Wade, California Farm Water Coalition  
Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District  
Emilia Wisniewski, East Bay Municipal Utility District  
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Board  
Mary Zauner, Los Angeles County Sanitation District

Curtis Anderson, DWR, Northern Region Office Chief  
Carmel Brown, DWR, Executive Assistant, Integrated Water Management  
Abby Carevic, DWR, Northern Region Office, Water Supply Evaluations  
Kent Frame, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency  
John Kirk, DWR, South-Central Region Office, Groundwater Section  
Jim Lin, DWR, Water Use and Efficiency  
Chris McCready, DWR, IRWM Regional Planning Branch Chief  
Nancy Miller, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination  
Salomon Miranda, DWR, Floodplain Management  
Paul Shipman, Department of Water Resources  
Toni Pezzetti, DWR, Water Recycling and Desalination  
Terri Wegener, DWR, Manager, Statewide Flood Management

Facilitation: Lisa Beutler, MWH, Executive Facilitator; Judie Talbot, CCP, Water Plan Facilitation Team